

REMARKS

Claims 1, 5, 6, 8-12, and 33-38, 40-52 are currently pending in the case. Claims 4, 7 and 39 are hereby canceled. Claims 1, 8, 11, 12, 36-38, 43, 46, 47, 51 and 52 are hereby amended. Claims 1 and 38 are in independent form. A Request for Continued Examination is hereby submitted. Please charge Deposit Account No. 02-1818 for any fees due in connection with this response.

The Office Action rejected independent claims 1 and 38 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) based on *Celis* (U.S. Patent 6,021,405) in view of *Budzik* ("Information Access in Context") and further in view of *Martin* (U.S. Application 2003/0005134).

Independent claims 1 and 38 recite, inter alia, "the at least one transformation rule being selected based on the plurality of text items and the active task" and "applying the at least one transformation rule to the at least one keyword, the transformation rule causing the at least one keyword to be replaced by another keyword." For example, if the user is a salesman in an engineering company working on a sales presentation, technical jargon in a search query may be replaced with straightforward language allowing the system to retrieve documents more applicable to the user's task (see ¶114 of the specification). *Celis*, *Budzik* and *Martin*, alone and in combination, fail to teach this feature.

Celis does not teach replacing keywords as currently claimed. *Celis* teaches a database query optimizer. Through the application of rules, *Celis* transforms logical expressions into execution plans. Those logical expressions may be wrapped around keywords (e.g., search terms). However, the database query optimizer of *Celis* does not transform those keywords. In addition, *Celis* does not teach selecting which transformation rules to apply based on the user's active task as currently claimed.

Budzik teaches transformation rules based on the text the user is viewing. For example, "capitalism" may be replaced with "communism" in a search query in order to find results associated with an opposing argument. However, *Budzik* does not teach selecting which transformation rules to apply based on the user's active task as currently claimed. In other words, the rule to replace "capitalism" with "communism" is executed regardless of the user's active task.

Martin teaches a system that selects messages for a user based on that user's profile. Messages are not transformation rules. *Martin* does not teach transformation rules, let alone the selection of transformation rules based on the user's active task as claimed. *Martin* teaches presentation rules. These presentation rules "provide instructions to the client as to when to present the content and the order and/or priority by which the content should be presented to the user" (§55).

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, all pending claims are condition for allowance, and the rejection should be withdrawn. An earnest endeavor has been made to place this application in condition for formal allowance, and in the absence of more pertinent art, such action is courteously solicited. If the Examiner has any questions regarding this Response, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

K&L GATPS LLP

BY 

James F. Goedken
Reg. No. 44,715
Customer No. 24573

Dated: January 14, 2010